

REMARKS

Without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejections in the Office Action dated June 30, 2009, claim 1 has been amended. Entry of this amendment, reconsideration of the present patent application and allowance of all claims pending herein are respectfully requested in view of the remarks below. Claims 1-4 are now pending.

Specification Objections:

The Abstract of the Disclosure allegedly did not commence on a separate sheet in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.52. An Abstract on a separate sheet is provided herewith and thus this objection is believed to be overcome. The Abstract has also been amended to clarify the subject matter therein.

§ 102 Rejections:

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,015,747 to Kim.

Amended claim 1 of the present application recites, *inter alia*, a method for reducing a dynamic offset during the processing of asymmetric single sequences. A single sequence includes pulses and interpulse periods subjected to high-pass filtering by means of a high pass containing a capacitor. During each interpulse period, the capacitor is discharged by a controllable element bridging the capacitor by an amount which depends on the value of the amplitude of the input-side voltage of the high pass.

Kim discloses a device for controlling a frequency response by scaling an impedance which includes a filter and a duty ratio controller. Kim discloses a switch controlled by a duty ratio controller, but the switch does not discharge a capacitor. The switch is not suitable to discharge a capacitor by an amount which depends on the value of amplitude of the input-side voltage of the high pass filter in contrast to the recitation in claim 1. Instead, the switch in Kim is suitable to control the frequency response, because the frequency response of the filter varies in response to a duty ratio of the duty-controlled clock signal controlling the switch as described in column 2, lines 48-50, for example.

Further, the Office Action is not clear relative to how Kim discloses all the elements of claim 1. The generality of referring to figures 4-9 of the cited reference (shown below) is not sufficiently specific to provide a *prima facie* case for anticipation. Instead, all of the elements of a claim must be found in the disclosure of a single reference for anticipation.

FIG. 4




FIG. 5




FIG. 6 (PRIOR ART)




FIG. 7 (PRIOR ART)




FIG. 8





FIG. 9



U.S. Patent No. 7,015,747 to Kim]

Accordingly, because all the features (e.g., a capacitor discharged by a controllable element bridging the capacitor during each interpulse period wherein the discharge amount depends on the value of the amplitude of the input-side voltage of the high pass) of claim 1 are

not identically disclosed by Kim, this claim cannot be anticipated thereby. Thus, claim 1 is believed to be allowable along with the dependent claims which are believed to be allowable for the same reasons and for their own additional features.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the telephone number provided.

Respectfully submitted,



Victor A. Cardona, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,589

Dated: December 30, 2009

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.

5 Columbia Circle

Albany, New York 12203

Telephone: (518) 452-5600

Facsimile: (518) 452-5579

Attachment: Abstract